

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are pending in the application.

The specification has been amended to correct a typographical error. No new matter is added by this amendment.

I. Request for Corrected Notice of References Cited

In the Office Action, the Examiner has cited United States Patent No. 5,989,527 to Siegfried. This document, however, does not appear on the Notice of References Cited provided with the Office Action. It is requested that the Examiner provide a Notice of References Cited subsequent correspondence that lists the '527 patent, so it can be formally made of record in the application.

II. Correction of Typographical Error in "Cross Reference To Related Application" Section

The applicant has amended the specification at paragraph [0002] to correct a typographical error in the serial number of the prior filed provisional application. However, the date and the inventor's name were correctly provided such that the correct application was identified by the Examiner as a priority document.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the Examiner's objection is rendered moot.

III. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 Based Upon Either One of United States Patent Nos. 5,833,961 or 5,989,527

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 5-11 and 13-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and claims 4 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based upon the disclosures of each of United States Patent Nos. 5,833,961 or 5,989,527, each to Siegfried *et al.* ("Siegfried '961 or Siegfried '527").

As basis for the anticipation rejection, the Examiner, relying solely on Siegfried '961, contends that the Siegfried references teach a polyester-based sunscreen composition comprising a polyol polyesters and sunscreen active agents. The Examiner argues that the Siegfried compositions of the Examples are not shown to contain any silicone fluids; therefore, according to the Examiner, they meet the negative limitation of claim 1 is met.

As basis for the obviousness rejection, Examiner contends that the Siegfried, while not discussing the polyesters having only those claimed carboxylic acids of Claim 12, the Examiner contends that Siegfried states that polyesters are formed from a reaction of the diol and a diacid which may have further terminal end groups functionalized by reacting with a mono-functional acid having 2 to 40 carbon atoms such as propionic acid, butyric acid, etc. Therefore, the Examiner reasons it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to prepare a polyol polyester containing both a monofunctional carboxylic as well as the diacid and still expect an effective sunscreen composition.

The applicant traverses each of the rejections.

Siegfried '961 is directed to polyester based sunscreen formulations containing functionalized polyesters and at least two organic active sunscreen ingredients. None of the polyesters disclosed in Siegfried '961 has the specific structure of Formula I as claimed. Siegfried '961 has not identified the disclosed polyesters as having use as a replacement for low viscosity silicone fluids in personal care compositions. Moreover, while the examples of Siegfried '961 do not include a low viscosity silicone fluid, Siegfried '961 does not teach or suggest expressly that low viscosity silicone fluids should be omitted.

The invention as claimed is directed to compositions to replace the lower viscosity silicone fluid in conventional personal care composition or methods of preparing personal care products while retaining the skin feel and consistency attributes of personal care products that contain low viscosity silicone fluids. The claims recite at least one polyol polyester that is the esterification reaction product of a polyol having 3 to 6 carbon atoms and a carboxylic acid having 3 to 6 carbon atoms with a personal care formulation, wherein the finished care product does not contain a lower viscosity silicone fluid. Siegfried does not teach or suggest that a lower

viscosity silicone fluid should be included or avoided in its sunscreen formulations. In fact, no express discussion of replacing or avoiding silicone fluids is provided.

Moreover, a person of skill in the art would have had no apparent reason to modify either of the Siegfrieds to arise at the invention as claimed. First, for the reasons discussed with respect to the 102 rejection, elements of the invention as claimed are lacking in either of the asserted references. Second, a person of skill in the art would not have been motivated to modify either of the Siegfrieds to contain the specific carboxylic acids listed in claims 4 and 12, there is no teaching art motivation or other factor that would have caused a person of skill to take the polyol polyesters of Siegfried and modify the end groups to arrive specifically at the carboxylic acids of claims 4 and 12.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the obviousness rejection is overcome. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the claims are not anticipated by the Siegfried invention. It is requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw her rejection.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the applicant has fully distinguished the claims over the cited prior art. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims at the earliest opportunity are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

ROCCO BURGO

9 April 2008
(Date)

By: Kristyne A. Bullock

KRISTYNE A. BULLOCK

Registration No. 42,371

FLASTER/GREENBERG P.C.

8 Penn Center

1628 John F. Kennedy Blvd., 15th Floor

Philadelphia, PA 19103

Telephone: 215-279-9393

Direct Dial: 215-279-9910

Facsimile: 856-661-1919

E-Mail: Kristyne.Bullock@flastergreenberg.com